

THE NATIONAL ERA.

WASHINGTON, MARCH 13, 1851.

AGENCY FOR CLAIMS.—We call attention to the advertisement of Mr. GANOWAY, Agent for Claims. He will do all he promises.

EUROPEAN WORLD.—The spirited author of the series of letters thus entitled, will permit us to say that we think he betrays a little prejudice, at least against the English people. Able writers have a great deal to do in expatiating or allaying national antipathies.

ORANGE ORANGE SKED.—By a notice in our advertising columns, it will be seen that our friend Hinman, of Cincinnati, Ohio, has for sale a choice lot of this seed.

PUBLIC SERVANTS AND THEIR EMPLOYERS.

"If the friends of Mr. Webster, from their estimate of his public services, have voluntarily tendered to him a pecuniary compensation for the services which he has made by the acceptance of his present office, in the discharge of the duties of his profession, in which he held the highest rank; and if Mr. Webster, after having devoted the labors of a long life, to the service of his country, and the highest intellectual exertion, by the labors of no man living, in the duties of his profession or in the public services, finds himself at this period of his life in a condition to need, in the discharge of his obligations to his country, the services of a public servant, it is difficult to conceive of what ground either the offer or the acceptance of such an equivalent can be justly complained of."—*Boston Daily Advertiser*.

It was not necessary for Mr. Webster to make any sacrifice of his interests. He might have continued the practice of his profession, and another man would have filled with honor to the country, the post he now occupies.

On one side, was professional eminence with a fortune, on the other, political influence and preferment with a competence. He chose for his portion, political station, and the power, present and prospective, it promised.

State people will not be able to understand what sacrifice he has made in this, which laid his country or his friends under any special obligation. The idea of setting up a claim to public gratitude and extra compensation on the ground of having accepted an office, next in dignity and influence to that of President of the United States, is a Boston "notion" of the newest pattern.

The *Boston Courier* enters another plea in justification. It is disgusted with the republican simplicity, the economy of our Government.

It has been thought, it says, not only discreditable to the Government, but highly prejudicial to the public interest, that this Department should be situated in such a hazy region of doing the diplomatic honors of this great and prosperous nation, as are afforded by a salary of six thousand dollars a year. Certainly, if the work of the State Department is worth doing, it is worth doing well, and it is worthy of being decently paid for. No one who knows anything of Washington and public business needs to be informed that the salary of the Secretary of State is next to nothing as to pay for the labor and cost of holding the office. Nor if it is the duty of that any number of public-spirited persons in the United States, being desirous simply that the State Department should be kept in decent trim, and so maintained that every able man without a fortune should not be starved out of it—if it should so happen, we say, that these persons were to take measures, under their own power, to meet any pecuniary exigencies arising in this Department, and were to hold their hands in readiness to keep the public servants free from embarrassment—we desire to know whether such a proceeding would not be a citizen-like and praiseworthy act?

A salary of six thousand a year will enable a gentleman of frugal habits to live comfortably and respectably in Washington, in the exercise of all ordinary hospitalities and civilities; and, though a Secretary of State, he may entertain as often as may be necessary, elegantly, if not sumptuously, his diplomatic friends. More than this ought not to be looked for from the functions of a Government, established, not for show, but for use; not by the will and for the benefit of a proud, vain-glorious, luxurious aristocracy, but by the will and for the benefit of a nation of free men, plain, hardy, hard working, and of simple manners. If a Secretary of State is not to do as he would, let him do as he can, and if he cannot do with the servant of a foreign Power, in the grandeur of his entertainments, let him not be ashamed to confess that the Sovereign he serves does not tolerate extravagance and luxury. We should set an example of manly simplicity to foreign courts, and not stoop to the meanness of attempting to rival their pageants.

But, these papers maintain that an officer of the Government may, without impropriety, receive pecuniary support from private individuals, either as a reward for supposed public services, or to enable him to live in a more imposing style than his regular salary permits. Let this become the usage, and what security could we have against favoritism and corruption on the part of those administering the Government?

Suppose an eminent citizen, nominated to the Supreme Bench, and hesitating about accepting the appointment, should consent to waive his objections, provided a fund of fifty thousand dollars was raised for him by a few thousand men. In addition to the salary allowed him by law, would not the People pronounce that he had laid himself under an obligation repugnant to that absolute independence and impartiality demanded in the administration of justice?

Suppose the Iron and Coal Interests of Pennsylvania should bestow a fortune on the Secretary of the Interior, or the Secretary of the Treasury, on the pretext that the salary allowed him by law was insufficient for his support; would not every one feel that he had suffered himself to be placed under bonds to promote those interests, and that a natural feeling of gratitude would inevitably dispose him to favor them in preference to others? And what would the North have thought, had Mr. Buchanan, previously to entering the State Department, received a purse of fifty thousand dollars, made up by the slave owners of the South, as a reward for his eminent services, or to enable him to keep the Department "in decent trim"? Such a transaction would have covered Mr. Polk's Administration with infinitely more odium than the *Clapham* affair fastened upon the Cabinet of General Taylor.

Has not the broker who has given a Secretary of State five thousand dollars, a right to expect that he will not be overlooked in any money transaction of the Government under the superintendence of that officer; or, that a friend of his, being an applicant for office, may calculate pretty certainly on special attention to his claim? He may be disappointed, but, if he should be, it would be because his official friend had more or less virtue than falls to the lot of human nature generally. How can a man thrust his hand into the fire, and not be burned? A Secretary of State has no right to expect a miracle to save him from a temptation to which he voluntarily subjects himself. Better live in poverty, than under pecuniary obligation. It is for the People, through their representatives, to provide by law for the support of those who serve them. They have done so, and, in doing so, they have endeavored to relieve their servants from dependence upon the charity of friends. "Public-spirited persons" would do wisely to respect their will, and not impose to them a miggly economy. The officers of the Government are responsible to the People, but it is permitted to draw their support from individuals or classes, this responsibility will be weakened, and a portion of their allegiance be insensibly transferred to voluntary benefactors.

If it be proper for Mr. Webster to be supported by "public-spirited persons," it is proper for the other members of the Cabinet, some of them much poorer than himself. What a spectacle would be presented to the American People, should the disclosure be made that every member of the Cabinet, in testimony of his great services, and to enable him, despite the niggardly economy of the People, to keep his Department "in decent trim," had received from twenty-five to fifty thousand dollars,

made up from "certain public-spirited persons," connected with the Navy, with the Army, with the Coal and Iron Interests, &c.; and that, to aid the President in doing the diplomatic business of this great and prosperous nation, the slaveholders had agreed to add from their own resources twenty-five thousand dollars to his present salary? Could an Administration thus bought do anything less than consult the will and interests of its purchasers?

If evidence were needed to show the degeneracy of the times, it would be found in the manner in which the Whig and Democratic papers have generally treated the transaction on which we are commenting. Many of the best of them openly justify it on grounds repugnant to every principle of true Republicanism, and insulting to the People; while many others are silent or indifferent. For ourselves, we hold that the purity and safety of our institutions require that every officer of the Government keep himself clear, during his term of office, from pecuniary obligation to "public-spirited persons," or classes, as being at war with his allegiance to Popular Rights and Interests.

IMPROVEMENT OF THE COLORED PEOPLE.

The *New York Evening Post* publishes some important official documents respecting a movement in England in relation to the emigration of the free people of color from this country to the British West Indies, the object of the movement being to obtain an adequate supply of labor for the islands. The following is a copy of a circular despatch, transmitted by Lord Grey, Secretary of State, to the Governors of the Colonies: "Down, St. James, October 16, 1850."

"Sir: I have to acquaint you that it has been suggested to me that a desirable class of emigrants for the West Indies might be induced to leave this country, and among the black and colored population of the United States, whose arrival and location, if they choose to come, would, have no doubt, be advantageous both to themselves and to the Colonies.

"I am not aware of anything which can be done by the Colonial Governments to encourage such immigration, beyond showing a readiness to pass any laws which might be necessary to give any persons who might come to settle there, and providing that bounty should be payable on such immigration, under such arrangements as may be thought desirable.

"I would also suggest as deserving of consideration, whether laws might not be passed, rendering binding on certain conditions, engagements to pay some of money which may have been agreed upon by immigrants, although such engagements may have been contracted in America, and which would be a state of slavery.

"I have, &c."

"To the Officer administering the Government of the Leeward Islands," &c.

It is proposed that the emigration shall be carried on chiefly by individual enterprise, but such legislation is advised as shall promote it, and the attention of the Colonial Legislatures is directed to the following points:

"1. The settlement of American planters having capital and experience, as well as of colored laborers, should be encouraged, by affording them the utmost possible facility in obtaining the privileges of bringing their property to the Colonies.

"2. With the same object, provision should be made by law for giving legal validity to engagements entered into by immigrants, previously to their departure, for the purpose of enabling them to settle in the British Colonies.

"3. The Colonial Legislatures should pass laws, similar in principle to those which have been passed in Mauritius and Trinidad, to secure that any money being granted from the public revenue to pay for the introduction of immigrants, should be paid to the immigrants, and not to the agents, for five years after their arrival, either to enter into yearly contracts to labor, on which a stamp duty should be charged, or else to pay a small monthly tax in lieu of the latter, being both to stimulate the industry of the immigrants, and to obtain from them, directly or indirectly, the repayment of a part, at least, of what they had cost the Colony.

"Without any further interference on the part of the Colonial Legislatures than would be afforded by the above measures, the proposed immigration might, it is conceived, be carried on to a large extent, and with great advantage, by individuals, provided this were attempted judiciously."

As a necessary preliminary, measures will be taken to ascertain whether the Government of the United States will make any objection to the scheme.

We have little faith in the efficiency of Governmental schemes of emigration or colonization. The Government of Great Britain has been engaged for nearly fifteen years in the transportation of laborers to the islands, and in all that time the whole number introduced by its efforts has scarcely equalled the voluntary emigration from Europe to this country in one month.

We could wish that the colored people had more of that spirit of enterprise which animates the Anglo-Saxon race, making it the great colonizer and civilizer of the world. In our opposition to all projects of compulsory colonization, we fear we have unintentionally repressed the spirit of voluntary emigration among the colored people. African Colonization, at an early period, took such a form, and was advocated in such a way, as to nearly annihilate the spirit of enterprise of active Anti-Slavery men. It became in too many instances the ally of Slavery, excusing or justifying its existence, setting its face against Emancipation, unless connected with transportation, degrading the free people of color, discountenancing efforts for their elevation in their native land, and finding in proscription legislation against them not a fit subject for indignant rebuke, but a reason for their banishment.

The acknowledged consideration was not enough to decide our opinions against African Colonization; but they had nothing to do with the question of the voluntary emigration of colored people. It was well for them, had they more of the spirit of self-colonization. They see the white people about them with restless energies, constantly in motion, going from one place to another, from the walks of civilized life to the paths of wilderness, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, seeking all the while to better their condition.

The same men possessed with the same spirit of self-erecting, before they can expect to command a respectable position anywhere. Passive submission to continuity and wrong will degrade and paralyze any race of people. It is no virtue to suffer when we can right ourselves. The colored people should go precisely where they can live most comfortably, not bearing degradation, when by changing their residence they can acquire respectability.

The Pole who will not cross under the hoof of Russian domination, must seek freedom beyond its border. The Englishman, intolerant of the arrogance of a haughty aristocracy, the German wearied with the dead level of his monotonous existence, the Irishman, disgusted with filth and starvation, abandon the old familiar places, and begin a new life in a new world, where they may realize their highest aspirations; and their example does more for their countrymen whom they have left behind, than a century of suffering and degradation in company with them.

When a colored man would never rest from his wanderings till he had found a place where his children might grow up into the dignity of a noble manhood, unconscious of inferiority, untaught to bow, except before the face of their Creator. If degraded in the city, we would free the country; if persecuted in one State, we would try another; if without hope in the States, we would pitch our tents in their uninhabited territory.

Let the colored people arouse themselves. "Who would be free, themselves must strike the blow." Let them educate themselves—rely upon themselves—act for themselves—learn to move in concert, and emulate the enterprise that is diffusing the Anglo-Saxon race over the world. God helps those who help themselves. Why should they remain still, when the whole world is in motion? Every successful effort at self-elevation, no matter whether made in India, in California, Canada, Mexico, or the West Indies, will do more for their brethren in bondage at home, than any amount of meek submission to degradation. While the white population of Eu-

rope is colonizing the United States and Canada, why should not the colored population of the United States colonize Mexico and the West Indies? They can be citizens in both, equal in rights and dignity with native citizens; and their intelligence and familiarity with the art of self-government, would soon secure them the ascendancy in both countries.

But let the Government keep its hand out of the business. Let the people of Jamaica and the other islands take measures for diffusing in this country correct and ample information concerning the advantages to be secured by colored emigrants in the West Indies. Let them hold out inducements powerful enough to start the tide of emigration. Let our colored people consider the subject for themselves, and should they think favorably of it, organize bands of emigrants, for mutual comfort and protection, aspiring to do for the great West India archipelago what the European races are doing for this continent. It is a work worthy of their highest ambition, and it would tend to develop their energy and self-respect. They would then feel as if they too had a mission. No longer passive sufferers, looking to others for aid and protection, they would become active adventurers, relying upon their own strength, trusting to their own sagacity, and commanding the respect of mankind.

THE PROCLAMATION.

"Unhappy lies the head that wears a crown," and Louis Napoleon can testify that Presidential chairs of Republics are not always comfortable seats. No nail of official dignity is so painful as that which is driven into the back of the head by the public press.

The most strenuous efforts it was carried through the House, a large majority voting for it, and on being taken up in the Senate, towards the close of the session, several test votes showed a majority there of eight or ten in its favor.

Southern men, generally of extreme opinions on the Slavery Question, led the opposition to the measure, and they were aided covertly by prominent Democrats from the North, who insisted upon various amendments which, had they been adopted, would have given the opponents of the bill in the House full power to prevent its passage.

The device adopted by Southern men to defeat the bill, was to speak against time. After a full examination of its provisions, and with the acquiescence of the House, the bill was taken up in the Senate, and the majority of members in both Houses demanded its passage, they determined to prevent any vote upon the measure, though at the cost of the defeat of the Appropriation Bills and of an extra session of Congress.

From half-past eleven Monday till four o'clock Tuesday morning, Faction played its game without disguise. Mr. Clay, who had led on the majority, left the chamber near midnight, and Mr. Cass, who had dissented from the bill, but voted against laying it on the table, fearful of committing himself too far on one side or the other, drew his chair about at twelve o'clock, and retired, with the remark that, as the term of Congress in his opinion had expired, he declined to prolong the session by further proceedings.

At four o'clock Tuesday morning, the majority gave way; the bill was laid upon the table, and made special order for eight o'clock, the effect of which was to secure to any bill that might then be under consideration, preference over it, unless postponed by a vote of the Senate. There remained to be acted upon, the Civil and Diplomatic bill, the Army and Navy Appropriation bill, and the bill for the relief of Mr. Ritchie, so that it was well understood that the River and Harbor bill would never be taken up again.

After this matter had been discussed, various resolutions were submitted by Senators, and laid over under the rule. The Senate then went into Executive session.

Thursday was devoted to Executive business. Friday, it having been decided that the Senate might at an extra session, whatever it could do at any time without conjunction with the House, several resolutions were taken up and passed. A resolution authorizing the purchase of a certain number of copies of the Patent Office report was laid upon the table. Three thousand copies of the report of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institute were ordered to be printed. The terms of Mr. Davis of Mississippi and Mr. Mason of Virginia, as members of the Board of Regents, having expired, the President of the Senate, under authority given to him by that body, reappointed them.

Saturday, Mr. Yule sent in a communication intimating his intention to contest the seat to which the Legislature was assigned to be elected by the Legislature of Florida.

On motion of Mr. Hale, a resolution was adopted calling upon the Secretary of the Treasury for information in regard to the trade and commerce of the British North American Colonies. A resolution submitted by Mr. Badger, that each member of the Senate be supplied with twelve additional copies of the Congressional Globe, was on motion of Mr. Chase laid upon the table—yes, 26; no, 14. A resolution offered by Mr. Chase, for extra compensation to the employees of the Senate, was on motion of Mr. Foot laid upon the table. On motion of Mr. Foot, the President was called upon to communicate to the Senate copies of any correspondence between the Secretary of State and the American Minister at Constantinople, in relation to Kosuth.

Several appointments have been confirmed, and the following treaties ratified: A Treaty with Switzerland, a Tehuantepec Treaty with Mexico, and a Treaty with Nicaragua.

Appointments confirmed: John S. Pendleton of Virginia, to be Chargé d'Affaires of the United States to the Argentine Republic.

Ogden Hoffman, Junior, of San Francisco, to be Judge of the District Court of the United States for the northern District of California.

Horace Mower of Michigan, to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the Territory of New Mexico.

John S. Watts of Indiana, to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the Territory of New Mexico.

Louis de Meuse, to be Consul of the United States at Bonn, in the Duchy of Saxony Meiningen-Hildburghausen, in Germany.

Henry Jones of Pennsylvania, to be Consul of the United States at Belfast, in Ireland.

Henry A. Holmes of Massachusetts, to be Assistant Dragoman and Secretary to the Legation of the United States in Turkey.

The National Intelligencer says it has reason to believe that the prevalent rumor of the removal of Mr. Webster from the Secretaryship of Patents, is unfounded. It may be so; but we presume the ax is suspended over his head.

Monday, Mr. Cass rose to a personal explanation. He read the editorial article of the *Republican* of this morning, in which a letter written by General C. to Mr. Kellogg, upon the subject of the improvement of certain harbors in Michigan, and some editorial comments upon the course of General Cass with regard to the River and Harbor bill, had been published. He stated that that bill was one which contained items for which he collected six statements made by General Houston in his letter, and pronounced them false.

Mr. Kellogg briefly replied, contending that if any error occurred, it was wholly unintentional. Mr. Butler continued the matter, pointing out that on a former occasion he had shown to General C. a list of the improvements in Michigan, and that he had been misled by the statements of General Houston in his letter, and pronounced them false.

Mr. Hale, also, rose to a personal explanation, saying that he had been misled by the statements of General Houston in his letter, and pronounced them false.

There is a rumor that the River and Harbor bill will be taken up on Thursday, and that the Senate will pass it on Friday.

THE RIVER AND HARBOR BILL—HOW IT WAS LOST.

The loss of the River and Harbor bill must excite indignation among the Western People, especially when they remember with what facility the Light-house bill for the benefit of navigation on the Atlantic coast passed through both Houses, in the last session of the session, and how many millions were squandered on the Navy, the most useless branch of the public service. The commerce of our Lakes and Western Rivers, equal in value to our foreign commerce, suffers vast damage every year for want of safe and commodious harbors, and from obstructions which ordinary attention on the part of the Federal Government would readily remove.

The River and Harbor bill, which failed in the Senate from factional opposition, was not a perfect one. The aggregate of the appropriations, considering the present demands on the Treasury, was rather too large, and several improvements were embraced in its provisions, by no means national in their character. But, so great and urgent are the demands of our interior commerce, so long and shamefully have its interests been neglected, so signally have been the outlays for its benefit, that its real friends in Congress felt called to waive their constitutional scruples respecting particular improvements, and support the bill as a whole.

By the most strenuous efforts it was carried through the House, a large majority voting for it, and on being taken up in the Senate, towards the close of the session, several test votes showed a majority there of eight or ten in its favor.

Southern men, generally of extreme opinions on the Slavery Question, led the opposition to the measure, and they were aided covertly by prominent Democrats from the North, who insisted upon various amendments which, had they been adopted, would have given the opponents of the bill in the House full power to prevent its passage.

The device adopted by Southern men to defeat the bill, was to speak against time. After a full examination of its provisions, and with the acquiescence of the House, the bill was taken up in the Senate, and the majority of members in both Houses demanded its passage, they determined to prevent any vote upon the measure, though at the cost of the defeat of the Appropriation Bills and of an extra session of Congress.

From half-past eleven Monday till four o'clock Tuesday morning, Faction played its game without disguise. Mr. Clay, who had led on the majority, left the chamber near midnight, and Mr. Cass, who had dissented from the bill, but voted against laying it on the table, fearful of committing himself too far on one side or the other, drew his chair about at twelve o'clock, and retired, with the remark that, as the term of Congress in his opinion had expired, he declined to prolong the session by further proceedings.

At four o'clock Tuesday morning, the majority gave way; the bill was laid upon the table, and made special order for eight o'clock, the effect of which was to secure to any bill that might then be under consideration, preference over it, unless postponed by a vote of the Senate. There remained to be acted upon, the Civil and Diplomatic bill, the Army and Navy Appropriation bill, and the bill for the relief of Mr. Ritchie, so that it was well understood that the River and Harbor bill would never be taken up again.

After this matter had been discussed, various resolutions were submitted by Senators, and laid over under the rule. The Senate then went into Executive session.

Thursday was devoted to Executive business. Friday, it having been decided that the Senate might at an extra session, whatever it could do at any time without conjunction with the House, several resolutions were taken up and passed. A resolution authorizing the purchase of a certain number of copies of the Patent Office report was laid upon the table. Three thousand copies of the report of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institute were ordered to be printed. The terms of Mr. Davis of Mississippi and Mr. Mason of Virginia, as members of the Board of Regents, having expired, the President of the Senate, under authority given to him by that body, reappointed them.

Saturday, Mr. Yule sent in a communication intimating his intention to contest the seat to which the Legislature was assigned to be elected by the Legislature of Florida.

On motion of Mr. Hale, a resolution was adopted calling upon the Secretary of the Treasury for information in regard to the trade and commerce of the British North American Colonies. A resolution submitted by Mr. Badger, that each member of the Senate be supplied with twelve additional copies of the Congressional Globe, was on motion of Mr. Chase laid upon the table—yes, 26; no, 14. A resolution offered by Mr. Chase, for extra compensation to the employees of the Senate, was on motion of Mr. Foot laid upon the table. On motion of Mr. Foot, the President was called upon to communicate to the Senate copies of any correspondence between the Secretary of State and the American Minister at Constantinople, in relation to Kosuth.

Several appointments have been confirmed, and the following treaties ratified: A Treaty with Switzerland, a Tehuantepec Treaty with Mexico, and a Treaty with Nicaragua.

Appointments confirmed: John S. Pendleton of Virginia, to be Chargé d'Affaires of the United States to the Argentine Republic.

Ogden Hoffman, Junior, of San Francisco, to be Judge of the District Court of the United States for the northern District of California.

Horace Mower of Michigan, to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the Territory of New Mexico.

John S. Watts of Indiana, to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the Territory of New Mexico.

Louis de Meuse, to be Consul of the United States at Bonn, in the Duchy of Saxony Meiningen-Hildburghausen, in Germany.

Henry Jones of Pennsylvania, to be Consul of the United States at Belfast, in Ireland.

Henry A. Holmes of Massachusetts, to be Assistant Dragoman and Secretary to the Legation of the United States in Turkey.

The National Intelligencer says it has reason to believe that the prevalent rumor of the removal of Mr. Webster from the Secretaryship of Patents, is unfounded. It may be so; but we presume the ax is suspended over his head.

Monday, Mr. Cass rose to a personal explanation. He read the editorial article of the *Republican* of this morning, in which a letter written by General C. to Mr. Kellogg, upon the subject of the improvement of certain harbors in Michigan, and some editorial comments upon the course of General Cass with regard to the River and Harbor bill, had been published. He stated that that bill was one which contained items for which he collected six statements made by General Houston in his letter, and pronounced them false.

Mr. Kellogg briefly replied, contending that if any error occurred, it was wholly unintentional. Mr. Butler continued the matter, pointing out that on a former occasion he had shown to General C. a list of the improvements in Michigan, and that he had been misled by the statements of General Houston in his letter, and pronounced them false.

Mr. Hale, also, rose to a personal explanation, saying that he had been misled by the statements of General Houston in his letter, and pronounced them false.

There is a rumor that the River and Harbor bill will be taken up on Thursday, and that the Senate will pass it on Friday.

There is a rumor that the River and Harbor bill will be taken up on Thursday, and that the Senate will pass it on Friday.

There is a rumor that the River and Harbor bill will be taken up on Thursday, and that the Senate will pass it on Friday.

There is a rumor that the River and Harbor bill will be taken up on Thursday, and that the Senate will pass it on Friday.

There is a rumor that the River and Harbor bill will be taken up on Thursday, and that the Senate will pass it on Friday.

REJECTION OF HUGH N. SMITH.

HUGH N. SMITH, the intelligent, high-spirited delegate from New Mexico, who so ably urged his claims during the first session of the Congress which has just expired, was nominated lately by the President, as Secretary for New Mexico. He was well qualified for the highest office in the Territory, and had better claims to official station in New Mexico than a resident of the States. Nobody could doubt his entire competence, or his fidelity to the interests of his constituents. But the Senate, acting in secret session, rejected his nomination.

The Senate then went into Executive session, and at 4 o'clock adjourned.

THE DUTY OF ANTI-SLAVERY VOTERS.

Mr. Lewis of Cincinnati has another article on the first page of this week's *Era*, on the duty of anti-slavery voters. He writes with his characteristic strength and earnestness, and his arguments are entitled to great consideration. Our position he does not fully understand. We do not differ from him in any essential point. We both agree as to the necessity of an organization of the friends of liberty, the duty of prompt and independent action, the policy of organizing our forces in every State. What we dissented from was the attempt to re-organize at this time the national Liberty Party, on the single idea of opposition to Slavery, with its old mode of action. Liberty party is a name which has been applied all that it was adapted to accomplish, and was absorbed in a more general, more efficient movement.

It does not follow that another organization is not now wanted. Forms and names are nothing—we want unity and efficiency.

Old Party issues are losing their importance. The Democratic Party can hardly be said to exist, at least, with a charter of principles. The Whig Party is in a state of anarchy. The leaders of both evince, everywhere, a disposition to unite for the purpose of sustaining each other against the advancing tide of liberal opinion. Questions which once divided them have lost their significance, and other questions have arisen on which they fear to commit themselves.

It is thought by many of our friends that the times require the formation of a new party, taking the Democratic principle, as its central idea, and boldly applying it to the solution of all the political questions pressing upon the Public Mind. The movement is a new one, they say, should originate in State action. Let the friends of Freedom in Ohio, for example, call a State Convention, on the basis of Land Reform, River and Harbor Improvements where the works are of national interest and require national enterprise, Elections of all Officers by the People, Free Trade, Opposition to Class Legislation, Divorce of the Federal Government from all support of Slavery, and Opposition to the Evil within constitutional limits.

Let the Convention meet at its early day as may be convenient, issue a Declaration of Principles, assume the name, Democratic, as the title of the Party thus organized, invite all Liberal Anti-Slavery men to hold similar Conventions in their respective States, for the purpose of forming similar organizations, and issue a call for a National Democratic Convention, embracing all who are willing to adopt such principles, to meet, say at Buffalo, Cleveland, or Pittsburgh, next September or October.

Let that Convention adopt a complete platform of Democratic Principles, in their legitimate application to all practical political questions, including that of Slavery, and let it call a National Convention to meet the following May or June, to take into consideration the subject of nominating a candidate for the Presidency to be supported in 1852.

This is the plan suggested by many true friends of Freedom, and we see no objection to it. Such a Party would comprehend a large majority of the anti-slavery voters of the country, and attract the materials from the old, worn-out organizations. It would combine comprehensiveness of policy with unity of principle and purpose. It could not be charged with cowardice in the application of its principles, or with neglecting one interest in its zeal to advance another. It would be impartial, harmonious, complete, prepared for every good word and work.

Undoubtedly, not a few anti-slavery men, who dissent from radical Democratic Principles, might deem it inconsistent to unite with such a Party, but they would recognize the great importance of its organization, and feel strengthened by its influence in whatever modes of action they should deem proper for themselves. The new organization would be tolerant, recognising the sincerity and sustaining the wise efforts of those who, unable to unite with it in all its views, should still evince an honest purpose to maintain such of them as they believed sound.

This, we repeat, is the scheme of action proposed by many good and true men, and if we are to have a new national organization, we confess the policy suggested commends itself to our judgment. Holding ourselves to our party always, and free from the trammels of Party, we are ready at all times to sustain those who advocate the Truth, whatever name or formula they may adopt, and the more Truth they incorporate in their creeds and schemes of policy, the more cordial shall be our support.

TWO WEEKS LATER FROM CALIFORNIA.

The new steamship *Atlanta* arrived at New York, eight days and six hours from California, bringing intelligence from California, two weeks later. She had on board 255 passengers, and \$450,000 in gold dust. There had been no election of United States Senator—Colonel Fremont's chances were improving. The Indian difficulties were increasing every day. The *New York Tribune* says:

"The Indian disturbances have become serious, and we see little prospect of their being settled, except by a war of extermination. There never can be permanent peace between the motley communities of the great river, the 'redskins' and 'prospectors' who, during the summer, penetrate to all the valleys and fastnesses of the Nevada, and the Indians, whom they necessarily oppress and oppress."

The imposition of the new rough state, has the most sovereign contempt for every other race than his own, and it is useless to expect him to treat with any degree of justice the brutish degraded 'digger' of California, standing lowest in the scale of the aboriginal tribes of this continent. The Commissioners may make treaties, but what shall prevent their immediate violation? The Indian numbering probably not more than 20,000 in all, and divided into a number of small tribes, and scattered over a region more than ten thousand miles in extent—a region, too, which years to come will be virtually without the pale of the State jurisdiction. A single lawless act will be sufficient to undo all the work of the Government agents, and renew the old state of anarchy and confusion of warfare. We have a better feeling may prevail, as the mining communities become permanent and more thoroughly organized. The California Indian will soon enough be a subject of the inevitable course of that destiny which has opened the long-hidden treasures of the Pacific coast to the energies of civilization."

REDUCED POSTAGE, AFTER JUNE 30, 1851.—Letters, not exceeding half an ounce, and within 3,000 miles, 3 cents prepaid; 5 cents not prepaid; and the same for additional half ounce or fraction thereof. Over 3,000 miles, double these rates. Foreign letters, wholly or in part by sea, under 2,500 miles, 10 cents; over 2,500 miles, 20 cents; but no charge is made in existing postal arrangements with foreign countries. Drop letters one cent; advertising one cent.

Sack, Prock,
article neces-
sary emergency
without de-
R. HOWE,

THE NATIONAL ERA.

SPEECH OF WILLIAM H. SEWARD
ON THE
MANAGEMENT AND DISPOSITION OF THE PUBLIC DOMAIN.

Delivered in the Senate of the United States, Feb. 27, 1851.

MR. PRESIDENT:

The organization of the American Republic is a political anomaly. Ancient and modern States, rarely constituted within narrow limits, have been enlarged themselves by colonies and conquests, while passing through various revolutions of government. But the world has never before seen a State assume a perfect organization in its very beginning, and extend itself over a large portion of a great continent, without conquests, without colonies, and without undergoing any change of constitution.

The success of Portugal and of the Netherlands in planting profitable commercial colonies in the East Indies, in the French and Spanish colonies, stimulated nearly all the European States to attempt to secure similar advantages, by exploring and appropriating to themselves portions of the New World, then known as the Western Indies. Spain, Britain, and France, divided between themselves nearly all North America. Each of these Kingdoms, however, pursued a policy so rigorous as to hinder the growth of the colonies it planted.

The United States, in the Revolution of 1776, supplanted Great Britain in sovereignty over the region lying between the St. Lawrence and Louisiana, and stretching from the Atlantic coast to the banks of the Mississippi.

The European States, practically independent of each other, were embarrassed by conflicting boundaries. The controversy was magnanimously ended, by an agreement that each should retain its claim of unappropriated territory for the common use and benefit.

New York led the way, and ceased her claims as a political power, as "of the right of soil," "to be and inure to the use and benefit of the United States as should become members of the Federal Alliance of the said States, and for no other use or purpose whatever."

Virginia claimed the broad region lying north-west of the Ohio River, and in 1784, by a declaration that it should "be considered as a common fund for the use and benefit of the United States as should become members of the Federal Alliance of the said States, and for no other use or purpose whatever."

Massachusetts soon afterwards released to the United States, "for their benefit, Massachusetts' claims."

Connecticut conveyed in 1786, in the same form, South Carolina, in 1787, "for the benefit of the United States, South Carolina's claims."

Georgia, in 1789, conveyed by a deed containing the same declaration, and had been used by Virginia, and Georgia completed the list of the United States by a cession on the same terms, attended with the same stipulations which are not now important.

The Constitution of the United States, adopted in the course of this great transition, sanctioned the following: "The Congress shall have power to dispose of, and make all needful rules and regulations respecting, the territory or other property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to prejudice any claims of the United States, or of any particular State."

The Constitution, Congress had previously adopted the Ordinance of 1787, by which they established a Government in the Northwestern Territory, and provided for its future subdivision into States. With a view to that great purpose, the Constitution declared that "New States may be admitted by the Congress into this Union."

The purchase of Louisiana from France in 1803, the acquisition of Florida by a grant from Spain in 1819, the discovery of Oregon, and the recent purchase of New Mexico and California, extended our domain along the shores of the Gulf of Mexico across the Rocky Mountains, and to the Pacific Ocean.

The aggregate quantity of this national estate is fifteen hundred and eighty-four millions of acres; of which one hundred and thirty millions are already being definitively appropriated, and there remain, including appropriations not yet perfected, fourteen hundred and fifty millions of acres.

Using only round numbers, these lands are distributed among the States and Territories, as follows:

| | |
|----------------|------------------|
| Alabama | 7,745,000 acres. |
| Arkansas | 2,731,000 " |
| California | 14,060,000 " |
| Colorado | 29,216,000 " |
| Delaware | 1,228,000 " |
| Florida | 14,308,000 " |
| Georgia | 22,854,000 " |
| Idaho | 27,492,000 " |
| Illinois | 31,801,000 " |
| Iowa | 27,153,000 " |
| Indiana | 27,439,000 " |
| Kansas | 27,439,000 " |
| Michigan | 27,439,000 " |
| Minnesota | 27,439,000 " |
| Mississippi | 27,439,000 " |
| Missouri | 27,439,000 " |
| Montana | 27,439,000 " |
| Nebraska | 27,439,000 " |
| Nevada | 27,439,000 " |
| New Hampshire | 27,439,000 " |
| New Jersey | 27,439,000 " |
| New Mexico | 27,439,000 " |
| New York | 27,439,000 " |
| North Carolina | 27,439,000 " |
| North Dakota | 27,439,000 " |
| Ohio | 27,439,000 " |
| Oklahoma | 27,439,000 " |
| Oregon | 27,439,000 " |
| Rhode Island | 27,439,000 " |
| South Carolina | 27,439,000 " |
| South Dakota | 27,439,000 " |
| Tennessee | 27,439,000 " |
| Texas | 27,439,000 " |
| Vermont | 27,439,000 " |
| Virginia | 27,439,000 " |
| Washington | 27,439,000 " |
| West Virginia | 27,439,000 " |
| Wisconsin | 27,439,000 " |
| Wyoming | 27,439,000 " |

These appropriations, the Senate will at once recall several acts of Congress, which are recorded in the whole, 79,000,000 acres for boundaries in the Mexican war, bounties in the year of 1812, gratuitous grants to the soldiers of the same war and in Indian wars, cessions of swamp lands to New States, and for the construction of a railroad from Chicago to Mobile and other internal improvements, none of which last-named cessions have yet been located.

The aggregate of revenues derived from the public domain is one hundred and thirty-three millions three hundred and thirty-three thousand nine hundred and ninety-three cents, showing an annual revenue of one million and six hundred and thirty-three thousand nine hundred and ninety-three cents.

Mr. President, I think the time is near at hand when the United States will be able to review their policy, and to consider the following principles:

First, That lands shall be granted in limited quantities, gratuitously, to actual cultivators only.

Second, That the possession of such grants shall be secured against the United States.

Third, That the United States shall relinquish to the States the administration of the public lands within their limits.

These principles, Sir, have no necessary connection. I shall therefore discuss them separately.

First, A gratuitous allotment of lands in limited quantities to actual settlers and cultivators only. This principle involves three propositions: 1. A limitation of the quantity which shall be granted to any one person.

Second, That the possession of such grants shall be secured against the United States.

Third, That the United States shall relinquish to the States the administration of the public lands within their limits.

These principles, Sir, have no necessary connection. I shall therefore discuss them separately.

First, A gratuitous allotment of lands in limited quantities to actual settlers and cultivators only. This principle involves three propositions: 1. A limitation of the quantity which shall be granted to any one person.

Second, That the possession of such grants shall be secured against the United States.

Third, That the United States shall relinquish to the States the administration of the public lands within their limits.

These principles, Sir, have no necessary connection. I shall therefore discuss them separately.

First, A gratuitous allotment of lands in limited quantities to actual settlers and cultivators only. This principle involves three propositions: 1. A limitation of the quantity which shall be granted to any one person.

Second, That the possession of such grants shall be secured against the United States.

Third, That the United States shall relinquish to the States the administration of the public lands within their limits.

These principles, Sir, have no necessary connection. I shall therefore discuss them separately.

First, A gratuitous allotment of lands in limited quantities to actual settlers and cultivators only. This principle involves three propositions: 1. A limitation of the quantity which shall be granted to any one person.

Second, That the possession of such grants shall be secured against the United States.

Third, That the United States shall relinquish to the States the administration of the public lands within their limits.

These principles, Sir, have no necessary connection. I shall therefore discuss them separately.

First, A gratuitous allotment of lands in limited quantities to actual settlers and cultivators only. This principle involves three propositions: 1. A limitation of the quantity which shall be granted to any one person.

Second, That the possession of such grants shall be secured against the United States.

Third, That the United States shall relinquish to the States the administration of the public lands within their limits.

These principles, Sir, have no necessary connection. I shall therefore discuss them separately.

First, A gratuitous allotment of lands in limited quantities to actual settlers and cultivators only. This principle involves three propositions: 1. A limitation of the quantity which shall be granted to any one person.

Second, That the possession of such grants shall be secured against the United States.

Third, That the United States shall relinquish to the States the administration of the public lands within their limits.

These principles, Sir, have no necessary connection. I shall therefore discuss them separately.

First, A gratuitous allotment of lands in limited quantities to actual settlers and cultivators only. This principle involves three propositions: 1. A limitation of the quantity which shall be granted to any one person.

Second, That the possession of such grants shall be secured against the United States.

Third, That the United States shall relinquish to the States the administration of the public lands within their limits.

These principles, Sir, have no necessary connection. I shall therefore discuss them separately.

First, A gratuitous allotment of lands in limited quantities to actual settlers and cultivators only. This principle involves three propositions: 1. A limitation of the quantity which shall be granted to any one person.

Second, That the possession of such grants shall be secured against the United States.

Third, That the United States shall relinquish to the States the administration of the public lands within their limits.

These principles, Sir, have no necessary connection. I shall therefore discuss them separately.

Second, That the possession of such grants shall be secured against the United States.

Third, That the United States shall relinquish to the States the administration of the public lands within their limits.

These principles, Sir, have no necessary connection. I shall therefore discuss them separately.

First, A gratuitous allotment of lands in limited quantities to actual settlers and cultivators only. This principle involves three propositions: 1. A limitation of the quantity which shall be granted to any one person.

Second, That the possession of such grants shall be secured against the United States.

Third, That the United States shall relinquish to the States the administration of the public lands within their limits.

These principles, Sir, have no necessary connection. I shall therefore discuss them separately.

First, A gratuitous allotment of lands in limited quantities to actual settlers and cultivators only. This principle involves three propositions: 1. A limitation of the quantity which shall be granted to any one person.

Second, That the possession of such grants shall be secured against the United States.

Third, That the United States shall relinquish to the States the administration of the public lands within their limits.

These principles, Sir, have no necessary connection. I shall therefore discuss them separately.

First, A gratuitous allotment of lands in limited quantities to actual settlers and cultivators only. This principle involves three propositions: 1. A limitation of the quantity which shall be granted to any one person.

Second, That the possession of such grants shall be secured against the United States.

Third, That the United States shall relinquish to the States the administration of the public lands within their limits.

These principles, Sir, have no necessary connection. I shall therefore discuss them separately.

First, A gratuitous allotment of lands in limited quantities to actual settlers and cultivators only. This principle involves three propositions: 1. A limitation of the quantity which shall be granted to any one person.

Second, That the possession of such grants shall be secured against the United States.

Third, That the United States shall relinquish to the States the administration of the public lands within their limits.

These principles, Sir, have no necessary connection. I shall therefore discuss them separately.

First, A gratuitous allotment of lands in limited quantities to actual settlers and cultivators only. This principle involves three propositions: 1. A limitation of the quantity which shall be granted to any one person.

Second, That the possession of such grants shall be secured against the United States.

Third, That the United States shall relinquish to the States the administration of the public lands within their limits.

These principles, Sir, have no necessary connection. I shall therefore discuss them separately.

First, A gratuitous allotment of lands in limited quantities to actual settlers and cultivators only. This principle involves three propositions: 1. A limitation of the quantity which shall be granted to any one person.

Second, That the possession of such grants shall be secured against the United States.

Third, That the United States shall relinquish to the States the administration of the public lands within their limits.

These principles, Sir, have no necessary connection. I shall therefore discuss them separately.

First, A gratuitous allotment of lands in limited quantities to actual settlers and cultivators only. This principle involves three propositions: 1. A limitation of the quantity which shall be granted to any one person.

Second, That the possession of such grants shall be secured against the United States.

Third, That the United States shall relinquish to the States the administration of the public lands within their limits.

These principles, Sir, have no necessary connection. I shall therefore discuss them separately.

Second, That the possession of such grants shall be secured against the United States.

Third, That the United States shall relinquish to the States the administration of the public lands within their limits.

These principles, Sir, have no necessary connection. I shall therefore discuss them separately.

First, A gratuitous allotment of lands in limited quantities to actual settlers and cultivators only. This principle involves three propositions: 1. A limitation of the quantity which shall be granted to any one person.

Second, That the possession of such grants shall be secured against the United States.

Third, That the United States shall relinquish to the States the administration of the public lands within their limits.

These principles, Sir, have no necessary connection. I shall therefore discuss them separately.

First, A gratuitous allotment of lands in limited quantities to actual settlers and cultivators only. This principle involves three propositions: 1. A limitation of the quantity which shall be granted to any one person.

Second, That the possession of such grants shall be secured against the United States.

Third, That the United States shall relinquish to the States the administration of the public lands within their limits.

These principles, Sir, have no necessary connection. I shall therefore discuss them separately.

First, A gratuitous allotment of lands in limited quantities to actual settlers and cultivators only. This principle involves three propositions: 1. A limitation of the quantity which shall be granted to any one person.

Second, That the possession of such grants shall be secured against the United States.

Third, That the United States shall relinquish to the States the administration of the public lands within their limits.

These principles, Sir, have no necessary connection. I shall therefore discuss them separately.

First, A gratuitous allotment of lands in limited quantities to actual settlers and cultivators only. This principle involves three propositions: 1. A limitation of the quantity which shall be granted to any one person.

Second, That the possession of such grants shall be secured against the United States.

Third, That the United States shall relinquish to the States the administration of the public lands within their limits.

These principles, Sir, have no necessary connection. I shall therefore discuss them separately.

First, A gratuitous allotment of lands in limited quantities to actual settlers and cultivators only. This principle involves three propositions: 1. A limitation of the quantity which shall be granted to any one person.

Second, That the possession of such grants shall be secured against the United States.

Third, That the United States shall relinquish to the States the administration of the public lands within their limits.

These principles, Sir, have no necessary connection. I shall therefore discuss them separately.

First, A gratuitous allotment of lands in limited quantities to actual settlers and cultivators only. This principle involves three propositions: 1. A limitation of the quantity which shall be granted to any one person.

Second, That the possession of such grants shall be secured against the United States.

Third, That the United States shall relinquish to the States the administration of the public lands within their limits.

These principles, Sir, have no necessary connection. I shall therefore discuss them separately.

First, A gratuitous allotment of lands in limited quantities to actual settlers and cultivators only. This principle involves three propositions: 1. A limitation of the quantity which shall be granted to any one person.

Second, That the possession of such grants shall be secured against the United States.

Third, That the United States shall relinquish to the States the administration of the public lands within their limits.

These principles, Sir, have no necessary connection. I shall therefore discuss them separately.

Second, That the possession of such grants shall be secured against the United States.

Third, That the United States shall relinquish to the States the administration of the public lands within their limits.

These principles, Sir, have no necessary connection. I shall therefore discuss them separately.

First, A gratuitous allotment of lands in limited quantities to actual settlers and cultivators only. This principle involves three propositions: 1. A limitation of the quantity which shall be granted to any one person.

Second, That the possession of such grants shall be secured against the United States.

Third, That the United States shall relinquish to the States the administration of the public lands within their limits.

These principles, Sir, have no necessary connection. I shall therefore discuss them separately.

First, A gratuitous allotment of lands in limited quantities to actual settlers and cultivators only. This principle involves three propositions: 1. A limitation of the quantity which shall be granted to any one person.

Second, That the possession of such grants shall be secured against the United States.

Third, That the United States shall relinquish to the States the administration of the public lands within their limits.

These principles, Sir, have no necessary connection. I shall therefore discuss them separately.

First, A gratuitous allotment of lands in limited quantities to actual settlers and cultivators only. This principle involves three propositions: 1. A limitation of the quantity which shall be granted to any one person.

Second, That the possession of such grants shall be secured against the United States.

Third, That the United States shall relinquish to the States the administration of the public lands within their limits.

These principles, Sir, have no necessary connection. I shall therefore discuss them separately.

First, A gratuitous allotment of lands in limited quantities to actual settlers and cultivators only. This principle involves three propositions: 1. A limitation of the quantity which shall be granted to any one person.

Second, That the possession of such grants shall be secured against the United States.

Third, That the United States shall relinquish to the States the administration of the public lands within their limits.

These principles, Sir, have no necessary connection. I shall therefore discuss them separately.

First, A gratuitous allotment of lands in limited quantities to actual settlers and cultivators only. This principle involves three propositions: 1. A limitation of the quantity which shall be granted to any one person.

Second, That the possession of such grants shall be secured against the United States.

Third, That the United States shall relinquish to the States the administration of the public lands within their limits.

These principles, Sir, have no necessary connection. I shall therefore discuss them separately.

First, A gratuitous allotment of lands in limited quantities to actual settlers and cultivators only. This principle involves three propositions: 1. A limitation of the quantity which shall be granted to any one person.

Second, That the possession of such grants shall be secured against the United States.

Third, That the United States shall relinquish to the States the administration of the public lands within their limits.

These principles, Sir, have no necessary connection. I shall therefore discuss them separately.

First, A gratuitous allotment of lands in limited quantities to actual settlers and cultivators only. This principle involves three propositions: 1. A limitation of the quantity which shall be granted to any one person.

Second, That the possession of such grants shall be secured against the United States.

Third, That the United States shall relinquish to the States the administration of the public lands within their limits.

These principles, Sir, have no necessary connection. I shall therefore discuss them separately.

Second, That the possession of such grants shall be secured against the United States.

Third, That the United States shall relinquish to the States the administration of the public lands within their limits.

These principles, Sir, have no necessary connection. I shall therefore discuss them separately.

First, A gratuitous allotment of lands in limited quantities to actual settlers and cultivators only. This principle involves three propositions: 1. A limitation of the quantity which shall be granted to any one person.

Second, That the possession of such grants shall be secured against the United States.

Third, That the United States shall relinquish to the States the administration of the public lands within their limits.

These principles, Sir, have no necessary connection. I shall therefore discuss them separately.

First, A gratuitous allotment of lands in limited quantities to actual settlers and cultivators only. This principle involves three propositions: 1. A limitation of the quantity which shall be granted to any one person.

Second, That the possession of such grants shall be secured against the United States.

Third, That the United States shall relinquish to the States the administration of the public lands within their limits.

These principles, Sir, have no necessary connection. I shall therefore discuss them separately.

First, A gratuitous allotment of lands in limited quantities to actual settlers and cultivators only. This principle involves three propositions: 1. A limitation of the quantity which shall be granted to any one person.

Second, That the possession of such grants shall be secured against the United States.

Third, That the United States shall relinquish to the States the administration of the public lands within their limits.

These principles, Sir, have no necessary connection. I shall therefore discuss them separately.

First, A gratuitous allotment of lands in limited quantities to actual settlers and cultivators only. This principle involves three propositions: 1. A limitation of the quantity which shall be granted to any one person.

Second, That the possession of such grants shall be secured against the United States.

Third, That the United States shall relinquish to the States the administration of the public lands within their limits.

These principles, Sir, have no necessary connection. I shall therefore discuss them separately.

First, A gratuitous allotment of lands in limited quantities to actual settlers and cultivators only. This principle involves three propositions: 1. A limitation of the quantity which shall be granted to any one person.

Second, That the possession of such grants shall be secured against the United States.

Third, That the United States shall relinquish to the States the administration of the public lands within their limits.

These principles, Sir, have no necessary connection. I shall therefore discuss them separately.

First, A gratuitous allotment of lands in limited quantities to actual settlers and cultivators only. This principle involves three propositions: 1. A limitation of the quantity which shall be granted to any one person.

Second, That the possession of such grants shall be secured against the United States.

Third, That the United States shall relinquish to the States the administration of the public lands within their limits.

These principles, Sir, have no necessary connection. I shall therefore discuss them separately.

First, A gratuitous allotment of lands in limited quantities to actual settlers and cultivators only. This principle involves three propositions: 1. A limitation of the quantity which shall be granted to any one person.